

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/526,780	03/16/2000		Edward O. Clapper	INTL-0359-P1-US (P7596X)	1757		
7590 11/18/2003				EXAMI	EXAMINER		
Timothy N Tr	ор		PATEL, NITIN				
Trop Pruner &	Hu PC	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER				
Ste 100				ARTONII	PAPER NUMBER		
8554 Katy Free				2673			
Houston, TX 77024				DATE MAILED: 11/18/2003	( -		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		_				alk			
4/5			Application	on No.	Applicant(s)	U			
Office Action Summary			09/526,78	0	CLAPPER	_			
			Examiner		Art Unit				
			Nitin Pate		2673				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commu or Reply	nication app	ears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	idress			
THE N - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failui - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN risions of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com period for reply specified above is less than thirty ( period for reply is specified above, the maximum s re to reply within the set or extended period for repl eply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.13 munication. 30) days, a reply tatutory period w y will, by statute,	36(a). In no even within the statuilly apply and wice cause the apply	ent, however, may a reply be time story minimum of thirty (30) days Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ication to become ABANDONEI	ely filed s will be considered time the mailing date of this of (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on <u>25 Au</u>	<u>igust 2003</u>						
2a)⊠	☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☐ This action is non-final.								
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)⊠	)⊠ Claim(s): <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.								
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>2-5,11-17</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>1,6-10 and 18-20</u> is/are rejected.								
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or	election re	equirement.	·				
Applicati	on Papers								
9) 🗌 .	The specification is objected to by the	ne Examiner	r.						
10) 🗌 🤄	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	: a) <u> </u>	epted or b)	$\square$ objected to by the E	Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11)∐	The oath or declaration is objected t	o by the Ex	aminer. No	te the attached Office	Action or form P	TO-152.			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120								
a)[ * S 13)	Acknowledgment is made of a clain All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority 2. Certified copies of the priority 3. Copies of the certified copies application from the International Cee the attached detailed Office action communications as pecific reference was included TCFR 1.78.  1. The translation of the foreign lance communication is made of a claim and the communication of the foreign lance as pecific reference was included in the first service.	documents documents of the prior onal Bureau on for a list of for domestic ed in the firs nguage prof for domestic	s have been to have been to the certiful to priority ur to sentence visional ap	n received. In received in Application received in Application at the proceive at 17.2(a)). The copies not receive at 17.3 U.S.C. § 119(e) of the specification or application has been received at 35 U.S.C. §§ 120	on No  Id in this National  Id.  If (to a provisional  In an Application  In and/or 121 since	al application) Data Sheet. a specific			
Attachment									
2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Ination Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) F		·	4) Interview Summary 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 09/526,780

Art Unit: 2673

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1,6-9,18-20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brusky et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,111,569) in view of Bartlett (U.S. Patent No. 6,347,290).

As per claims 1,18 Brusky shows a wireless peripheral for a receiver having a housing; only one keyboard defined in the housing, the keyboard having a pair of wireless interfaces that transmit wireless signals directed at sufficiently spaced angles with respect to one another to enable signal (In Fig.1 element 70 and three IR emitters) and receiver to receive signals 9In Fig.1 element 10 and In Col.2 lines 40-57).

Brusky does not show providing a different functionalities depending on the orientation of the housing. Bartlett shows different functionalities with orientation with the housing (In Abstract and In Col.3, 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention was made to allow the teaching of Bartlett's into device of Brusky's because it would have determine a series of position commands that correspond to the series of orientations of the device.

Application/Control Number: 09/526,780

Art Unit: 2673

As per claim 6, Brusky shows a controller connected to a keyboard 9ln col.2 lines 51-57).

As per claims 7,8,19 Brusky shows wireless interfaces are infrared and angled sufficiently that one signal is detected by a receiver (In col.2 lines 45-47 and In col.3 lines 10-25).

As per claim 9, Brusky shows the interfaces are at an angle of 45 degrees (In fig.1).

3. Claims 10,20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brusky et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,111,569) in view of Bartlett (U.S. Patent No. 6,347,290) in further view of Henty (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,156).

Neither Brusky nor Bartlett shows a keyboard has at least two different orientations such that the keyboard is arranged to a user in each of the orientation that a different one of the interface is aligned with the receiver. Henty shows keyboard has at least two different orientations such that the keyboard is arranged to a user in each of the orientation that a different one of the interface be aligned with the receiver (in fig.1a, 1b, 2a and In fig.5a, 4,5b and In Col.3 lines 10-67 to col.4 lines 1-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art, at the time of the invention was made to allow the teaching of Henty's into combined system of Brusky's and Bartlett's because it would have activated only one function on a receiver that match the functionality of the transmitter that would not have inadvertently activated other device or function on a receiver.

Application/Control Number: 09/526,780

Art Unit: 2673

### Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 08/25/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument that Brusky does not teach different functionality that distinguished each other, Examiner disagree with this arguments in fact the Brusky's reference shows three different IR interface that select three different devices via interface if it does not select one of the device than by interface than by all different interface only one device could be selected s if a VCR or audio system or a TV could be selected by a different functionality of the signal so it does have different functionality t distinguished the device in order to select.

#### Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2673

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nitin Patel whose telephone number is 703-308-7024. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin H Shalwala can be reached on 703-305-4938. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-308-9052 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9618.

NP

November 17, 2003

VIJAY SHANKAR PRIMARY EXAMINER